

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

09 October 2017

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Not peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Bexley, E. M. (2011) 'Review of †Tesoriero (C.), Muecke (F.), Neal (T.) (edd.) Lucan. Pp. xii 540. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010. Cased, £85, US\$135(*Paper*, \$37.50, *US\$65*). ISBN : 978-0-19-927722-3 (978-0-19-927723-0pbk).', *Classical review.*, 61 (1). p. 309.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X10003094>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This article has been published in a revised form in *The Classical Review* <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009840X10003094>. This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution, re-sale or use in derivative works. ©The Classical Association 2011.

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Review: notes

1. Translation in brackets makes for difficult reading, especially in articles like Bonner's and Thompson's/Bruère's. (The translations in Green's article work well because he has done them himself. Not a solution, however, for the first set of articles – all the authors are dead.) Also, in Rosner-Siegel and Green, it is generally only the block quotations that are translated. This makes for easier reading. Overall, the translation seems erratic, since in the Rosner-Siegel article, one-line quotations are sometimes translated, sometimes not. Also, the translation is, on occasions, inaccurate or simply clumsy.
2. Why no Fred? "The Pivot of the Pharsalia" article pretty influential?
3. Much of Dante not translated in Fraenkel's article.
4. With the exception of Conte's piece, the first batch of articles are fairly tedious (if necessary) pieces of scholarship. Perhaps the collection could have been arranged differently?
5. Thompson's and Bruère's article, while useful, is a good example of the tedious quellenforschung that was practiced prior to Hind's work on intertext.
6. Another significant omission: O'Higgin's 1988 article on the *vates*.
7. Leigh's article is interesting (as all of Leigh's stuff is), but very few of its pages actually dwell on Lucan. The episode of Caesar and the grove is important, though, and other articles have been written on it, so perhaps one of them could have been chosen?
8. This leads me to another point: there is a tension inherent in this volume that may be the fault of the series more than the compiler, namely, that a collection of the most influential articles on Lucan does not necessarily represent the most significant episodes in the poem. Caesar and the grove is an episode that has generated many articles, but it is debatable whether any single one of them could rightfully be called 'influential'.
9. The German scholars have certainly made it in to this volume. What about the Italian scholars? Narducci?
10. One section could be entitled: "Context" (or some such) and include Bonner's, Lintott's and Martindale's articles.
11. Overall, what we learn from this volume is that Lucan scholarship has a long way to go before it can stand beside the work done on his predecessors, Ovid and Vergil.
12. Paradox inherent in the ORCS project: if the article is so canonical, it is unlikely to have been published somewhere obscure. So why reprint? If it is from an obscure source, chances are it is not really that influential.
13. Helzle's article: is it really that influential? It seems an odd choice.

14. There is surprisingly little in this volume about Lucan's "poetics". Most of it is context – historical, historiographic, social, political, literary. Does this tell us something about the editor's choice or about Lucan scholarship or both?